INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
OKADA, Keisuke (resumed)	29284
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Kennan	29284
MORNING RECESS	29305
Cross (cont'd) by Dr. KIYOSE	29306
Ouestion by the President of the Tribunal, Sir William Webb	29313
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Blakeney	29314
Redirect by Mr. Warren	29316
Recross by Mr. Keenan	29318
(Witness excused)	29319
HIRANUMA, Setsuko	29319
Direct by Mr. Warren	29319
(Witness excused)	29326
NOON RECESS	29330
AFTERNOON RECESS	29365
KAMEYAMA, Kazuji	29387
Direct by Mr. Yamaoka	29387

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

No.	Def. No.	Pros. No.	Description	For In Ident.Evidence
2587	3231		Affidavit of HIRANUMA, Setsuko	29321
2225	3232		October 15, 1932 issue of "Tokyo Asahi Shimbu (No. 16692) - Newspape Article by Ambassador HIROTA, Koki	un" er 29380

Thursday, 25 September 1947 2 3 4 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST 5 Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building 6 Tokyo, Japan 7 8 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 9 at 0930. 10 11 Appearances: 12 For the Tribunal, all Members sitting, with 13 the exception of: HONORALE JUSTICE R. B. PAL, Member 14 from Incia, not sitting from 0930 to 1600. 15 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 16 For the Defense Section, same as before. 17 18 (English to Japanese and Japanese 19 to English interpretation was made by the 20 Language Section, IMTFE.) 21 22 23 24

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

h

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session. THE PRESIDENT: Major Moore.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore): If the Tribunal please, language corrections on exhibits 3145-A and 774-A have been made and are being distributed. Since these corrections do not affect the transcript, they will not be read at this time.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief of Counsel.

KEISUKE OKADA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KEENAN (Continued):

follows:

Admiral, at the meeting of the Jushin on 29 November 1941 was not the most important information you desired to obtain specifically whether an attack against the United States, Great Britain and the Netherlands had been definitely determined?

I have not heard any information in that connection.

My question was, was not that the prime information you sought?

24

A The Senior Statesmen all sincerely desired to know the true situation, both domestic and international.

Q Admiral, I am afraid you do not understand me. Was not one of the most important things in the true situation the intention of the government to strike immediately -- to strike at America, Great Britain and the Netherlands by way of war?

A We wished to know that fact very much but we were not told of it.

Q Were you War Councillor at the time?

A I was not a War Councillor.

Q If you had been, you would have had that

Q If you had been, you would have had that information on 29 November 1941, would you not?

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Warren.

MR. WARREN: If your Honor please, we wish to object to that question. It is speculative and calls for a conclusion of the witness, if he knows.

MR. KEENAN: Your Honor, I am asking him for his present information now, not then. We all know now. I want it in the record.

THE PRESIDENT: I understand Colonel Warren is objecting to your asking this question: Would a War Councillor know. You are asking, in effect, what knowledge a War Councillor has, whether he gets that

3

2

6

5

8

9

LO

11

13

14

16

17

18

20

21

23

kind of information --

MR. KEENAN: That is correct. That is the question.

THE PRESIDENT: That is not objectionable.

You must answer the question, if you know,
of course.

A I know nothing.

Q You had been War Councillor at one time, had you not?

A Yes, I was.

Q And you knew, did you not, that the army was completely without the control of Japanese Government and remained so up until the great war of 1941, is that a fact?

I withdraw that question, your Honor, and put another one.

There were elements, Admiral, that were attempting to control the future of Japan by the employment of force that were difficult to ascertain?

A I believe that is so.

Q And, very briefly, that was the same movement that brought about the attempt upon your life while you were Prime Minister?

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, 1f-THE INTERPRETER: The witness answered, "Yes."

2

5

6

7

8

100

10

12

13

14

16

17

19

20

21

22

25

3

7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, we submit that yesterday they objected to our attempting to introduce evidence of the same kind with reference to Baron HIRANUMA, and this question certainly then has no foundation. It cannot help the Tribunal at all. THE TERMINATE I want to clear a point.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, I suggest that this is their witness and if they wanted the information yesterday they ought to be more pleased to get it today. The current to the any opinion

THE PRESIDENT: On the motion of the prosecution we yesterday on at least two occasions excluded as irrelevant the evidence of the operations of individual would-be assassins. If you want to establish there were assassin societies, that is another matter and we may have to hear argument on it.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, what we are seeking to show is that now this group had actually marched in to control the government of Japan under the leadership of TOJO, the accused.

MR. WARREN: If the prosecution desires to admit the imminent peril which these men operated under, then we withdraw objection to this and at a later time will attempt to bring in additional evidence on the same thing.

5

7

8

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, in answer to that it is profoundly important -- and I think the prosecution should be frank and we do admit as much -that there were lawless elements in Japan, as we contend, and that it did encompass some danger to take high position.

THE PRESIDENT: I want to clear a point. We excluded the evidence of what an individual attempted because that was only indicative of that individual's opinion. I do not recollect the document's saying that any would-be assassin expressed any opinion about anybody except in that way. By his action he showed what he thought of the individual.

Whether the operations of whole societies in that direction would make any difference is a question I think we ought to hear argued if you desire to have it argued. admiral, you cartainly did not know that wen

had been decided upon shen you want to mivise the

apperer, did you?

Dir weeks ago this Cabinat was chosen with

the approver of the same Jushin that sought information

3

4

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

MR. KEENAN: My point for the moment, Mr. President, is this, and I think we ought to make it very clear. According to the accused, although I doubt if there would be unanimity on the part of the accused -- Our theory is, Mr. President, that the gangster element -- I dislike using that term but I know of no other word that more neatly expresses it -- had actually got control of the government of Japan in 1941 under TOJO. THE PRESIDENT: I understand that Colonel Warren is not pressing his objection. I may have

misunderstood him.

MR. WARREN: That is correct, sir, under the admission of the prosecution.

MR. KEENAN: I would like to correct that and insert the word, from our viewpoint, "contention," instead of "admission."

Admiral, you certainly did not know that war had been decided upon when you went to advise the Emperor, did you?

Yes. A

Six weeks ago this Cabinet was chosen with the approval of the same Jushin that sought information 29 November, 1941?

Yes. A

18

19

20

21

22

23

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q After your conference with the Cabinet you lunched and advised with the Emperor -- the Jushin?

A Yes.

Q The most important thing you had to advise with the Emperor was whether or not war should be instituted now against the United States, Great Britain and the Netherlands? Isn't that true?

A No, that is not so.

Q Well, it was a very important thing to discuss with the Emperor, was it not?

A Of course, it was a very important thing, but up to that moment we had not heard a word as to whether 'ne government was actually intending to open hostilities or not.

Q In other words, you did not know that at the very time you were seeking information from TOJO's Cabinet a fleet was on its way, prepared and under orders to strike at Pearl Harbor?

A I did not know at all.

And when you met with the Emperor 29 November-and my questions are addressed to that meeting for the
time being -- is it not a fact that each member of the
Jushin gave his advice to the Emperor, or expressed
his judgment?

A Yes, we did express our own views.

Q And there were, all told, I believe, eight present -- eight Jushin, former Prime Ministers?

A Yes, that is so.

4

3

1

5

7

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

17

19 20

21

23

22

24

25

Q Did any one of the eight express, or even indicate -- express to the Emperor that he had sought information as to the present state of affairs internationally with the United States, Great Britain and Netherlands, and had been refused such information on the ground that it was a state secret?

A I think I did that.

Q Any others?

A I do not remember.

Q Was the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal there at the time?

A The Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal was present at the luncheon with the Emperor and at the meeting following the luncheon when we advised the Emperor.

Q When you informed the Emperor that you had sought --- withdraw that. Did you specifically state that you had sought this information from the Cabinet and it had been denied you?

A I expressed it in much milder terms.

Q By the way, for a moment, while we are on that subject, you used the words "negative" and "dissuasive" in your affidavit. What is the meaning

2

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

14

15

17

18 19

20

22

23

25

Q And there were, all told, I believe, eight present -- eight Jushin, former Prime Ministers?

A Yes, that is so.

Q Did any one of the eight express, or even indicate -- express to the Emperor that he had sought information as to the present state of affairs internationally with the United States, Great Britain and Netherlands, and had been refused such information on the ground that it was a state secret?

A I think I did that.

Q Any others?

A I do not remember.

Q Was the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal there at the time?

A The Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal was present at the luncheon with the Emperor and at the meeting following the luncheon when we advised the Emperor.

Q When you informed the Emperor that you had sought --- withdraw that. Did you specifically state that you had sought this information from the Cabinet and it had been denied you?

A I expressed it in much milder terms.

Q By the way, for a moment, while we are on that subject, you used the words "negative" and "dissuasive" in your affidavit. What is the meaning

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

of the words "negative opinion was expressed", or "dissuasive opinion was expressed?" Does it mean, in substance, that, having no knowledge you could not give much worth-while advice?

This is the meaning: We could receive no worth-v le information from Prime Minister TOJO and we were very worried about this fact. This was what we told the Emperor.

Did the Emperor just listen, or did he do any talking?

The Emperor only listened. A

3

7

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

23

22

24 25

Was anything said to indicate that the Emperor had any knowledge that a fleet was already on its way under orders to attack Pearl Harbor at the time of your conference with him?

Nothing was said. I do not believe -- most likely the Emperor knew nothing about this fact.

Was that the opinion expressed by the Jushin after the meeting?

Yes, that is so.

If you had known that the fleet was on its way to Pearl Harbor definitely, would not you and your colleagues have vehemently urged the Emperor to make every effort to avoid this opening of the war?

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, I think this witness could answer what was in his own mind, but we do object to asking him what his colleagues might or might not do under certain circumstances.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, I would assume more than anyone else that counsel representing the innocence of HIRANUMA would want that question answered.

MR. WARREN: I do for HIRANUMA, but I do not know about other colleagues he had at the time, and I do not know what kind of answer it is going to be. If he confines it to HIRANUM, I would withdraw my objection.

2 conspirators. answer to that extent. 10 11 12 13 14 A

MR. KEENAN: I thought, Mr. President, that learned counsel was representing only HIRANUMA and DOHIHARA and did not admit a conspiracy and was not interested in the defense of the other alleged co-

THE PRESIDENT: There is no objection, if I understand Colonel Warren's objection, to this witness' speaking his own mind on the matter. So let him

MR. KEENAN: Could we have the question repeated, Mr. President?

(Whereupon, the question was read by the Japanese court reporter.)

Yes, that is so.

Now, of all the persons present, the one whose duty, officially, it would have been to make notes and record the proceedings would have been the accused KIDO?

Yes, that is so.

To refresh your recollection, Admiral, I will read two or three short sentences from KIDO's Diary which is in evidence, exhibit 1196.

I will ask you, Admiral, if this refreshes your recollection, reading from this exhibit, KIDO's notations:

20

15

16

17

13

19

21 22

23

4 5

"From 2 o'clock for about an hour in the soudy, the Emperor listened in person to the Senior Statesmen's opinions. The following is a summary.

"The Emperor remarked, the times have become very difficult, haven't they? To this Baron WAKATSUKI at once replied, in substance, as follows."

Mr. President, these are very short; otherwiseTHE PRESIDENT: I do not attempt to control
the Language Section. I cannot. I do not know enough
about the language. But I do know it is most difficult
to translate from English into Japanese. I may yet
read from this court a sample showing how difficult
it is.

MR. KEENAN: I am not speaking of the Japanese.

I am not in position to affirm or deny that. But I am speaking of referring to some matters that are already in the record which the Court ordinarily does not want repeated, and I was explaining the reason for short repetition to this witness at this crucial point in this examination.

Q (Continuing) "The Emperor remarked, the times have become very difficult, haven't they? To this Baron WAKATSUKI at once replied, in substance, as follows:

"WAKATSUKI: I am not worried about the

3

4

5

0

8

9

10

12

13

15

17

16

18

19

21

23

24

spiritual strength of our people but in the matter of materials the question of whether or not we can really stand a long-range war deserves careful study.

* * * * *

"HIRANUMA: His Excellency WAKATSUKI has spoken of the spiritual strength of our people and I agree with him on this point. But if today, when we have already been engaged in war for four years, things should further develop into a protracted war, it would become necessary to endure hardships and privations.

I therefore consider that adequate measures and efforts for bracing up public sentiment are necessary."

Is that not the advice that was given by the accused HIRANUMA to the Emperor on that vital occasion?

I have searched through other parts of the diary to find any other notations of HIRANUMA's state-ments at that meeting and find no other.

Can you recall any other remark, precise remark, to the contrary made by Baron HIRANUMA?

A I do not recall.

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, I wish to object to that last question.

THE RESIDENT: It is purely academic. He said he did not recall.

MR. WARREN: The first question was never answered, as I recall.

2

5

6

4

7

9

10

12

13

15

17

18

20

21

23

22

24

Q Coming now to the meeting in July of 1944, was Marquis KIDO present then?

A He did not attend the meeting of the senior statesmen.

Q Was it not a fact in 1944, in July, that it was evident that the Cabinet of TOJO was about to fall?

A Yes, that is so. dvice as fallows "As their

Q On page 6 of your affidavit, your testimony,
you state, top of page: "This resolution was passed
because it was apparent that the Cabinet had lost its
popular appeal."

Is it not a fact, Admiral, that things had gone badly for Japan at that time -- Saipan had been taken by the Allied forces -- and that the real purpose was to get a cabinet to meet that emergency?

A Yes, that is so. ... a and the sheet of

Q At that meeting the senior statesmen recommended the appointment of the accused KOISO as Prime Minister?

A Yes, that is so.

Q And at the meeting of the Jushin that took
place on 5 April 1945 -- I will call your attention to
the contents of exhibit 1282, entry from Marquis KIDO's
diary 5 April 1945, and read a short portion of it to
see if it doesn't refresh your recollection.

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

18

19

21

22

23

24

Q Coming now to the meeting in July of 1944, was Marquis KIDO present then?

A He did not attend the meeting of the senior statesmen.

Q Was it not a fact in 1944, in July, that it was evident that the Cabinet of TOJO was about to fall?

A Yes, that is so.

Q On page 6 of your affidavit, your testimony, you state, top of page: "This resolution was passed because it was apparent that the Cabinet had lost its popular appeal."

Is it not a fact, Admiral, that things had gone badly for Japan at that time -- Saipan had been taken by the Allied forces -- and that the real purpose was to get a cabinet to meet that emergency?

A Yes, that is so.

Q At that meeting the senior statesmen recommended the appointment of the accused KOISO as Prime Minister?

A Yes, that is so.

Q And at the meeting of the Jushin that took place on 5 April 1945 -- I will call your attention to the contents of exhibit 1282, entry from Marquis KIDO's diary 5 April 1945, and read a short portion of it to see if it doesn't refresh your recollection.

```
THE MONITOR: Mr. Prosecutor, we are looking for
the document, 1282. Will you give us a moment, please.
          We have it now.
          MR. KEENAN: Do you have the part referred to,
 Language Division?
          THE MONITOR: Yes, we do.
      Q Wasn't HIRANUMA's advice as follows: "As their
 Excellencies have said, the acute war situation today has
  given rise to various opinions which must be unified.
  There is no way out but to fight to the end. That problem,
  think, is simple." Do you not recall now that that was
13 the position taken by HIRANUMA on 5 April 1945?
           IR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, we wish
14
15 to object for the reason that this witness in his affi-
16 davit went into that matter, and upon the objection of
17 the prosecution yesterday where he explained this portion
18 the Court sustained the objection, and it was taken and
19 deleted from the affidavit. It could hardly be within
20 the scope now.
           THE PRESIDENT: I repeat that you can be prevented
22 from getting out in examination in chief things which
  your opponent is entitled to extract in cross-examination.
           MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, I would call atten-
  tion respectfully to the fact that we may -- while objecting
25
  to conclusions we never have objected to what was said.
```

I am asking now what HIRANUMA said rather than what this witness concludes to be HIRANUMA's position.

THE PRESIDENT: I am dealing with the objection as raised.

MR. KEENAN: I suggest, Mr. President, that what the defense is objecting to is not the subject matter of the cross-examination but the witness answering differently than they contended the facts to be.

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, the witness hasn't answered the question to which I objected, and the Court on the motion of the prosecution took this very subject matter out of the direct examination, and unless I am permitted to go into it at a later time the issue will never be cleared before this Tribunal and an injustice will be done.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is overruled.

The matter can be dealt with by Colonel Warren in reexamination if necessary.

MR. KEENAN: I want to correct my statement: "would answer" instead of "did answer."

May I ask that the question be repeated. I think perhaps it might not be precisely understood after this argument.

(Whereupon, the question was read by the official court reporter as follows:)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

"Q Wasn't HIRANUMA's advice as follows: their Excellencies have said, the acute war situation today has given rise to various opinions which must be unified. There is no way out but to fight to the end. That problem, I think, is simple.' Do you not recall now that that was the position taken by HIRANUMA on 5 April 1945?"

I cannot get the purport of the question.

Q I will simplify it for you, Admiral. I have just asked that there be read to you what Marquis KIDO recorded as having been said by HIRANUMA at that meeting. I want to know if that refreshes your recollection, if you deny that he said that in substance, or if you agree now with what KIDO said or wrote at the time?

at other in theory to the continuous of the war. At

we carried recognished and reach advocator who charge

assestice of bostializes. From this import, the

This that so enst have a penson the wall taget is out.

A I cannot recall very clearly. I will age you obout the ther gittenship in

KIND'S TELEPT WANTELL TREE (Bearing) &

18

19

20

23

24

25

unicator of a France Las teportant bearings. Inches

dentally, 2 as smalle to voter any opinion it it is

THE PARKET There and ten thesen of opinion

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: Can you recall at all?

THE WITNESS: HIRANUMA always said that it was necessary to fight to the end, so it may be that he did say so.

THE MONITOR: To find a man who would be able to carry the war through to the end, so he may have said it.

MR. KEENAN: Your Honor, I state that the prosecution has great respect and confidence in this witness and dislikes to press further questions. We will just ask one more question on this subject from KIDO's diary.

THE PRESIDENT: The difficulty about that statement is that he is not merely a defense witness, but a prosecution's witness.

BY MR. KEENAN (Continued):

Q I will ask you about another statement in KIDO's diary, exhibit 1282 (Reading):

"HIRANUMA: There are two phases of opinion at home in regard to the conclusion of the war. At this time we must have a person who will fight it out. We cannot recommend any peace advocator who favors cessation of hostilities. From this import, the choosing of a Premier has important bearings. Incidentally, I am unable to voice any opinion if it

means that all we have to do is to appoint the Premier and the rest to be left to him. I am strongly opposed to any advocacy for peace and cessation of hostilities."

Do I understand correctly that the purport of your affidavit was to the effect that HIRANUMA on 5 April 1945, the date of this excerpt that I have just read, was advocating -- was a real advocate of peace and cessation of hostilities at that time?

A In order to bring the war to a rapid conclusion -- in order to bring the war to an early conclusion, it was necessary to fight to the end -- to have a person who would fight to the end. That has been a contention of HIRANUMA at all times, so I believe that he may have said that.

THE MONITOR: Correction: A man who would go at it with a spirit of fighting to the end.

Q Does that mean something by way of a suicide attempt you are attempting to convey, Admiral?

A No, it is -- No, that is not what I meant.

It is a little different from a suicide attempt. In order to -- What I meant was that in order to bring the war to an early conclusion, it was necessary to go about things with the spirit of carrying the war through to the end, of carrying with firm determination.

Unless one went at it with that spirit, it would be difficult to conclude the war.

Q Well, in short, Admiral, from what you talked with HIRANUMA, was he thinking of surrender or even a more persistent and bitter and emphatic movement on the part of Japan? That is the pith of it.

A I believe his contention was to bring the war to an end as early as possible.

Q I am afraid you haven't answered the question, but I will not press it any further. At any event, you do not say to this Court that HIRANUMA indicated to you on 5 April, 1942 that he wanted to accelerate the end of the conflict at that time by way of negotiation for peace -- 1945.

A No, he did not.

Q A final question, Admiral; During all these discussions of the Jushin at or about 29 November, 1941,

12

11

6

8

9

10

13

14

16

18

19

20

22

23

was there any that concerned advices that the real efforts should be made to subdue and control the law-less elements in Japan before attempting to rectify things in China and in the United States of America and Great Britain?

A It is not in my recollection.

Q And you are certain in your mind that the Emperor of Japan, on the eve of the attack on Pearl Harbor, did not want the war to go on and would have done what he could to avoid it?

A Yes, I can answer that definitely. The Emperor was not concerned in winning or losing the war. He disliked war.

Q But, he was unable, with all of his power, to avoid it.

A Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: I fail to see the relevance of that in this trial.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, in view of the observation of the Court, the relevancy is the contention that these accused were engaged in the conspiracy and that they seized the power of Japan; they defrauded the people of Japan into believing that the Emperor was behind the war with the rescript that he issued a few days after or instantly, a few hours after the attack,

and that constituted lawlessness in Japan, as well as a part of the breach of international law, too.

THE PRESIDENT: This is the first time in the lengthy trial that that has been suggested, and it is contrary to the prosecution's evidence.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, I respectfully call this Tribunal's attention, as Chief Prosecutor appointed under this Charter, to the fact that the accused who are in the dock are the people we believe are really responsible for this war. If there had been anyone else, they would have been in the dock, too.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Warren.

MR. WARREN: Sir, there are some more questions that these other gentlemen have. We are one minute from recess time. I wonder if we could recess a little earlier.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

I oden to any that Agarn, ware as year hear Today

rendered but the the not give us may interprisely

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International K n Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. a 2 THE PRESIDENT: Doctor KIYOSE. p 3 DR. KIYOSE: I wish to ask a few questions & 4 relative to the defendant TOJO. K 5 CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) p 6 BY DR. KIYOSE: Concerning the meeting of the Senior States-8 men on November 29, 1941, you have testified that the Senior & tesmen requested information, but that the 10 government refused, saying that they were state secrets. 11 DR. KIYOSE: Mr. President, I am conducting 12 cross-examination. 13 Q On just what point did the government refuse 14 to give information, saying that they were state secrets? 15 All. Townsel to knew outersel to a self the 16 17 Q Do you mean to say that the government did not 18 reply to any one of your questions? 19 A Yes, that is so. 20 Did they reply to no questions at all, either 21 the questions you put or the questions any one else may

> A I didn't say that there were no replies. TOJO made many replies, but he did not give us any information as to what steps were to be taken in the future.

22

have put?

24

23

Is it not true that your affidavit concerns 1 not your desire to know of the future course of events, 2 and do not your replies to the cross-examination conduc-3 ted by Mr. Keenan also show that you were not request-4 ing information regarding the future course of events, 5 but that you stated that the materials on which to 6 arrive at a just estimate of the situation in which the 7 state the was were lacking? 8 I don't understand the purport of the question 9 very well. I would like to have it repeated. 10 You state that the government refused to give 11 you information, but is it not true that what you were 12 after was not the future course of action the government 13 was planning to take, but the actual situation as it then 14 existed and as it had been developing up to that time? 15 16 What I wanted to know concerned not only the 17 present but also concerned the future. 18 What did you want to know about the present and 19 the future? 20 I wanted to ask what the government intended to 21 do. 22 f you wanted to know what the government 23 wanted to do, does that not only concern the future?

We didn't know of the present either.

"hat questions did you ask concerning the

24

4

5

7

D

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

present?

We wanted to know what the government was doing at that time.

learned cothang from him of cost we really worked

I am not quite satisfied, but I shall leave it 0 at that point. We SECRET, President of the Planning

you state that this conference was held in the morning and in the afternoon. From what time to what time was the morning session held?

The morning session began around 9:30 and I believe it continued to about 11:30.

Do you have no recollection as to whether or not the meeting continued longer than that, and that finally, upon the permission of the Emperor, the questions and answers continued until past noon?

I don't recall clearly.

In any event, it would be quite a long session, wouldn't it, if it lasted from nine until afternoon -to almost noon? What did the government explain during this long period?

The government through the then Foreign Minister TOGO explained the impasse in the Japanese-American negotiations up to that time. weet him - figures ballur

Is that all?

tions given were happygard and TOJO gave a general explanation of events, but these were things of which we were already informed.

"7e learr	ed nothing from him of what we really wanted
to know.	the while to describe SUZDKI's explanetions 25
0	Nothing else?
A	I don't recall distinctly.
0	Then, I shall ask you: Was there not an ex-
planati	on given by Mr. SUZUKI, President of the Planning
Board?	voted on the Digwiss which you yourself possessed
A	Perhaps there was. I don't remember clearly.
	What you wanted to know in relation to the situ-
ation a	s it existed at that time pertained to the resource
	n and her national strength, did it not?
A	
. 0	Did not Mr. SUZUKI, President of the Planning
	explain this in great detail?
	I don't recall that he gave a detailed explana-
A	1 don't recarr when the
tion.	Do you recall that he gave any explanation at
C	Do you recall that he gave and our
all?	
A	Yes, I do recall that he did give some explana-
tions.	
Ö	HH () () () () () () () () () (
. A	
	THE INTERPRETER: Correction: figures taken
at ran	dom. The explanations given were haphazard and
not re	liable, I believe.

0 hen, did you have the knowledge necessary in 1 order to be able to describe SUZUKI's explanations as 2 haphazard? 3 A In certain connections I myself had made a 4 study and had my own figures. O Then, did you ask SUZUKI if his figures were 6 correct, based on the figures which you yourself possessed! 7 A No. I did not. andions I become. 9 a (Continue) - and at that time drive Minister 10 1670 sintha, "it I have you the figures and statistics 11 I bolleve you sould understand, but nince these Ilegres. 12 or statistics are state secrets. I we would to company 13 This war in the spende of the Emperor. 14 15 16 I would rather you maked 2000 himself about 17 About, my to what figures. 18 Q But die not those finence rufer to the answer 19 which has been cade to your questions? 20 Xes. 21 Then you ought to be sale to know what the 22 firmes were close. a I tollow you can understant by the pravious question and answer follo, in raply to my entestion. 25 said. "I believe you would be able to understand if I

23

3

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

22

24

25

21 23 Q Why didn't you?

A During the audience with the Emperor, following the luncheon, I told the Emperor that the morning session was devoted primerily to explanations by the government, and that the more I asked of the government the more concerned and worried I became, and --

THE INTERPRETER: Correction: The more I heard from the government the more concerned and anxious I became.

A (Continued) -- and at that time Prime Minister TOJO stated, "If I gave you the figures and statistics I believe you would understand, but since these figures or statistics are state secrets, I am unable to do so." This was in the presence of the Emperor.

Q What figures?

I would rather you asked TOJO himself about that, as to what figures.

Q But did not those figures refer to the answer which had been made to your questions?

Yes. dier on the work take

Q Then you ought to be able to know what the figures were about.

A I believe you can understand by the previous question and answer TOJO, in reply to my question, said, "I believe you would be able to understand if I

quote figures," but that he could not do this because they were state secrets.

Other than this, I am not informed.

DR. KIYOSE: I shall pass on to my next question.

Q Chief Prosecutor Keenan asked you what questions the Emperor put, or if the Emperor put any questions, but there is one point which still remains to be clarified.

A What was the question?

Q What was the Emperor's question, or what questions did the Emperor put?

A I believe that his first words, the Emperor's first words, then were, "This has become an impossible situation." After that he just listened.

Q I think you can hardly say that the Emperor's words "This is an impossible situation" or "This is a difficult situation" is a question. It is a statement, is it not?

A Depending on how you take it, it can be either a question or a statement.

Q Then did you reply to the Emperor as to the advisability of starting a war or not starting a war, based on that statement of the Emperor?

A I knew the Emperor's feelings very well. He

21

22

20

18

19

23

24

was not concerned with the winning or losing of a war as much as his hatred for war from the standpoint of the welf 'e of humanity in general, and I agreed with this sentiment of the Emperor.

Q In your affidavit you state that "After we had finished our meal each of us submitted our dissuading opinion to the Throne." Is that so?

A Yes.

In view of what you have said previously, I wouldn't think the question of dissussion or of carrying things ahead could arise.

A That was how I felt. I do not know just exactly what the other Senior Statesmen felt -- how they felt.

DR. KIYOSE: Then, I shall ask you one more question.

Q What was the purpose, what was the idea, of the government in holding this council of Senior Statesmen, since it was the government that had called this meeting together in the first place?

A In the morning session the government had made explanations concerning the impasse in the Japanese-American negotiations. I believe that was the purpose for the government's convening the meeting.

THE PRESIDENT: Did the Emperor say that there

21

18

19

20

22

24

was one question to be settled?

THE WITNESS: No. I have not heard that.

Q May I understand your answer to the previous question as follows: that the purpose of the meeting was to explain the situation vis-a-vis the Japanese-American negotiations?

A Yes, I believe so.

DR. KIYOSE: Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I shall cross-examine on behalf of TOGO, Shigenori.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. BAKENEY:

Q You have already said, Mr. Witness, that at the meeting of 29 November 1941 explanation was given by the Foreign Minister, TOGO, concerning the Japanese-American negotiations. Can you state to the Tribunal to what extent such explanation was made?

A TOGO explained the progress of the Japanese-American negotiations in considerable detail.

Q Were questions put to the Foreign Minister on this subject by the Elder Statesmen present?

A I believe two or three questions were put to him.

Q Did Mr. TOGO, the Foreign Minister, give answers to such questions as were put to him?

8

1

3

4

6

7

9

11

12

14

15 16

17

19

20

22

23

24

Yes, TOGO replied to these questions, and I believe that those who asked the questions were satisfied with his enswers. MR. BLAKENEY: Thank you. 'HE PRESIDENT: Colonel Warren. 5 of Prine Minister. Will you toll the Tribunal why 6 you that that he knew -- that that the tes his position? 7 A I heard this from Minantia Maseif. . . I you at the further in your africavit, in substance, that he did not give we his public reason 10 the ranger which he had expressed to you in private. 11 Will you toll cas intomest, if you know, may be old 12 set express sold lely the same thing he teld you in 13 ow Lunton 14 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief of Councel. The 15 MR. REEMEN'S Mr. President, the presention 16 ellects to that question. It was impropor at the time 17 of eitset empirector, and nothing has necessed in 18 any depresentation to wake it more compared than 19 20 it was before. It onlis for a conclusion. 21 THE PERSIDENT: We con give permission to 22 rack in re-examination a question that should have 23 been put in examination in chief. 24 Fut it is this form: Did HIBARUMA toll you

Greenberg & Barton

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. WARREN:

Admiral, in your original affidavit you stated HIRANUMA thought that the war could certainly be brought to an end if SUZUKI accepted the portfolio of Prime Minister. Will you tell the Tribunal why you felt that he knew - that that was his position?

A I heard this from HIRANUMA himself.

Q You state further in your affidavit, in substance, that he did not give as his public reason the reason which he had expressed to you in private. Will you tell the Tribunal, if you know, why he did not express publicly the same thing he told you in private.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief of Counsel.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, the prosecution ebjects to that question. It was improper at the time of direct examination, and nothing has occurred in any cross-examination to make it more competent than it was before. It calls for a conclusion.

THE PRESIDENT: We can give permission to ask in re-examination a question that should have been put in examination in chief.

Put it in this form: Did HIRANUMA tell you

MR. BARREN: May this witness be excused.

15

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

3

4 5

6

8

10

11

13 14

15 16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

his reason? You have our permission to ask that question.

Q Did HIRANUMA tell you the reason that he did not state publicly the same reason he gave to you in private as to why he thought FUZUKI would make a good Prime Minister?

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, we object to that question. I do not think the Court indicated it be asked because it contains a suggestion of the type of answer desired. I have no objection to this witness telling what HIRANUMA did say without prompting from the questioner in the form of the question.

THE PRESIDENT: We will receive the answer.

A Yes, I have heard the reasons from HIRANUMA.

Q Will you give those reasons to the Court as he gave them to you or repeat the conversation as nearly as you recall?

A HIRANUMA's statement to me in private that the appointment of SUZUKI would bring about early peace could not be offered in public because, if he did so, this would not have been peace and it would prevent the formation of the succeeding cabinet.

THE MONITOR: "HIRANUMA told me that," followed by that recent statement.

MR. WARREN: May this witness be excused,

2

3

4

your Honor? Oh, pardon me.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief of Counsel.

MR. KEENAN: I have two questions to ask of this witness.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KEENAN:

Q The first one is, Admiral, was the meeting of the Jushin, to which you referred, public or was it extremely private?

A It was not held in extreme secrecy, and at the same time it was not exactly official -- public.

Q Were there any newspaper reporters present?

A No.

Q Were its deliberations published in the press or in any other manner made public?

A No.

Or. KIYOSE what the purpose was of the Jushin being called together on 29 November, 1941. I ask you, since there was a refusal to give vital information on the course intended by the cabinet, if it isn't apparent to you that the calling of the Jushin together at that time was a mere gesture and a fraud.

A Depending on one's views, perhaps, it might be described that way.

5

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

	MR. KEENAN: I have no further questions.
T	hank you.
	MR. WARREN: May this witness be excused
0	n the usual terms?
	THE PRESIDENT: He is excused on the usual
t	erms.
	(Whereupon, the witness was ex-
	cused.)
	MR. WARREN: We call as our next witness
H	IRANUMA, Setsuko.
	G a figure on any one relief with the contract and an experience
8	ETSUKO HIRANUMA, called as a witness
	on behalf of the defense, being first duly
	sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters
	as follows:
	DIRECT EXAMINATION
B	Y MR. WARREN:
	Q Will you state your name and present address
t	o the ribunal, please.
	A My address is 1059 Yoyogi Oyamacho Shibuyaku,
	okyo; my name, HIRANUMA, Setsuko.
	MR. WARREN: May the witness be shown de-
f	ense document 2587?
No.	(Whereupon, a document was handed
	to the witness.)

3

5

7 8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17 18

19

20

22

23

24

25

Q Will you look at that document and tell the Tribuna. Whether or not that is your affidavit and if the contents are true.

DIR ECT

A There is no mistake.

MR. WARREN: We now offer in evidence defense document 2587.

THE PREFIDENT: Mr. English.

MR. ENGLISH: If the Tribunal please, the prosecution objects as being immaterial and irrelevant and as containing opinions and conclusions. The affidavit merely relates an attempted assassination of HIRANUMA by a gang of soldiers and a few students and the destruction by fire of the home within which he was living at that time, in August, 1945. We submit that the rulings made yesterday apply to this and davit.

IM. WARREN: May I be heard, your Honor?
THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Warren.

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, if the ruling of the Tribunal yesterday had not been fully explained, I probably would not have offered this document. But, in the face of the admissions of the prosecution or what they have termed contention of the prosecution, and also due to the further fact that this does contain statements which this witness heard herself,

while present at the attempted assassination, directly bearing on the point, I thought, perhaps, that this
document might not come within the ruling of the
Court yesterday but would be admissible at this time.
That is all the argument, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court overrules the objection and admits the document on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2587 will receive exhibit No. 3231.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3231 and received in evidence.)

MR. ENGLISH: If the Tribunal please, if I may, we think that the last paragraph on page 2 should be deleted from the affidavit, within the rulings previously made, as containing matters of opinion by a gang of men as to whether HIRANUMA was this way or that way.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal has given its decision and will not review it.

4

6

5

7

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25 mR. WARREN: There is one objectionable word which I shall not read, your Honor:

"My name is HIRANUMA, Setsuko. I was born in Kamakura, Japan in 1913, and now live at 1053 Yoyogi Oyamacho Shibuyaku, Tokyo. I have been asked if I know anything of the attack made on the home of the accused HIRANUMA on 15 august 1946. I do know because I was there and because that was my home. Baron HIRANUMA is my mother's uncle, but we always called him 'OJIISAN', Granddad, in our house. He was old and had no one to . take care of him; therefore, my parents, my two children and I lived with him. At that time my husband had been conscripted and was in the Navy. my mother was over sixty years of age, in delicate health, and I was managing the house.

"During the night of August 14-15, 1945, there had been an air raid alarm and we were in a dug out air raid shelter which was in our yard. At about 3 a.m. on the morning of the 15th of August the air raid alarm was lifted and we came out and went to bed in the house. at about 5:30 a.m. there was another alarm. I awakened, dressed and was ready to go into the shelter again when I learned that this time the raiders were carrier borne planes and not bombers. I attempted to get my children to go back to sleep, but they wanted to stay up with me.

Had I not permitted them to do so I probably should never have seem them alive again, for suddenly I heard a terrific noise and loud shouting outside our house. I looked through my window and saw a gang of men coming through the front gate, making for the house proper. I had been warned by the police guards stationed in my house that something very unpleasant was likely to happen and I guessed accurately what this disturbance might mean. Just the day before one of the guards, TANAKA, Hiroshi, told me he did not like the way Army planes; that is, Japanese Army planes, had been flying low over our house and that we had better be prepared in the event they should drop bombs on us.

"I knew the mob entering our front gate had come up after Granddad HIRANUMA, because they had the police guards, about fifteen in all, lined up in a single row with their hands over their heads, and I heard the leader of the gang, whom I could see and whom I later learned was an Army captain by the name of SASAKI, shouting at the top of his voice. He was saying: 'Don't you know what sort of a ______ HIRANU.A is? You don't know, eh? He is a notorious leader of the pro-Anglo-American group. He is a traitor. Don't you realize our country is going to collapse and be destroyed? Guarding an arch traitor. You should be ashamed of your-

selves.' and the teacher have to be to be a transfer to posted the

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

"The first thing which occurred to me was that I must get Granddad away from the house. I left my children, who were clinging to me, a girl of 8 and a boy of 6, with an old Amah (elderly housemaid), and rushed towards his room. By this time a number of soldiers in uniform had come into the house and were throwing gasoline all over the house and setting fire to all the rooms one after another. Paper doors. screens and mats caught fire. I was not afraid, because I did not have time to become frightened, and besides, I was dressed in a kind of uniform we all used to wear in those days when there was an air raid. I was much too worried over Granddad to be afraid. I got about half way to his room but was choked my smoke and found it impossible to advance forward. At this time I heard one of the gangsters shouting, 'We can't find HIRANUMA', and another one shouted in reply, "He will be burned to death in a minute. When I heard this I felt that someone had managed to take Granddad away from his room just in the nick of time, and I returned immediately to the servants quarters and sought for my children and Amah, but they were nowhere to be seen. I was extremely worried and asked one of the soldiers in the house what he had done to them and where

24

23

22

they were, but he stated he did not know. I passed the leader of the gang and his soldiers when I was going out through the side gate. He was just inside the front gate with his men. They were all holding big drawn swords and pistols and covering the police guards with at least one machine gun. The Captain, whom I later learned, as I stated, was named SASAKI, glared at me but I asked one of the soldiers whether he had seen my children anyway. He replied in a very brusque manner that they had gone out.

"I then went around the house toward the yard of the neighboring building. This building happened to be an office and library of a cultural organization known as Mukyukai, and Granddad was its President. I thought he might he hiding there. Amah and my children were there. The gang had guarded the front gate and a side gate with machine guns in the event Granddad came out, but they had overlooked a third gate through which one could go directly into the Mukyukai library. In the library was a lone police guard, who made a sign to me, indicating that Granddad was in the building hiding. Some of the gang who raided our house that morning, appeared to have been students and one of them threatened Amah and my children with a drawn sword, in an attempt to force her to tell him where the old man was. He

looked extremely vicious holding his drawn sword over his head, and Amah thought sure he was going to kill her. However, he did not harm either her or the children.

"By the time I had located the children and

learned Granddad was in hiding, the house was in full blaze, and it was completely destroyed, except the garage, which was only half destroyed. The mob left in a truck and shortly afterward the firemen arrived with their pumps, but they were too late. According to my estimate and that of the guards, there were roughly forty men, mostly soldiers and a few students. This attack occurred the same morning Premier SUSUKI's house was assaulted, but his house escaped with only small damage."

You may cross-examine.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. English.

MR. ENGLISH, If your Honor please, there will be no cross-examination.

MR. WARREN: May the witness be excused on the usual terms?

THE PRESIDENT: She is released on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. WARREN: At this time, your Honor, we will offer the accused HIRANUMA, if the Court so desires, as a witness under Section 4b of the Charter. 3

1

. 2

4

6

17

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: The Court has nothing to add to what it has already stated in this regard.

MR. WARREN: I understand. I am not doing anything except making a record on the matter. Thank you, sir.

We have asked for certain reservations in the event we can receive additional evidence; and, with those reservations, we will pass the proceedings on to Mr. Yamaoka.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief of Counsel.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, I fail to note anything in the Charter with reference to reservations or fail to note anything in the rules of the Court as to reservations. I den't know whether HIRANUMA has been called to the stand or not. I want the record to so show.

Secondly, I ask that, if they have any further evidence as to HIRANUMA, they either present it now or that they be told that it will not be received at a later date unless an excellent reason is given for presenting it out of turn.

Mr. President, I would add to that that I

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

14

15 16

17

19

20

22

23

25

think a failure to so rule might lead to a parade of these accused afterwards, at a later date, a clutter of them taking the stand when they have declined to do it in the orderly procedure of the Court.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Warren.

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, the Tribunal ruled on this yesterday at the time the prosecution made objections to the type of evidence. When I asked for those reservations the Court made a note that I had made them. Of course, what you will do later depends on the time it is presented. I shall rest my case at the proper time in the estimation of this counsel.

I should like to point out further that this makes twice that prosecution has commented on the failure of HIRANUMA to to take the witness stand, contrary to the Charter. He has not gained permission from the Tribunal to do so. I think it should be called to his attention not to do that.

not accurately, even at the request of Colonel Warren, call my attention to such revision of the Charter because it doesn't exist. Furthermore, Mr. President, the subject matter has been open about the takin, of the stand by Colonel Warren himself.

2

5

7

9

10 11

12

13

15

17

18

20

21

23 24

25

He has said, as far as this record is concerned, that he calls this witness. Now, I ask for a ruling by this Court: Has the witness been called by the counsel for this accused? Has he seen fit to take the stand or hasn't he?

MR. WARREN: Your Honor, I offered him under Section 4b of the Charter, that's all, and explained to the Tribunal why. That is the same article that counsel says does not exist.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, the article that I had reference to in the Constitution was the request for this Court to admonish me not to refer to the fact that the accused had not taken the stand. That is definitely what I understood Colonel Warren to advert to. To avoid confusion, Mr. President, does the Court rule that the accused has been offered as a witness or not? I would like to know so the record can be clear. It is a type of legal prestidigitation. I do not understand it.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Warren.

R. WARREN: Your Honor, I based this on Section 4, Article 11b, and I object to the use of the word "prestidigitation," whatever it was, because this is something that is done in every military tribunal. It happens with the British; it happens

in our Nawy; it happens in our Army; and this is a 1 military tribunal under the Charter. There is nothing wrong with it, no legal tricks. 3 THE PRESIDENT: I will confer with my col-4 leagues on this matter. They may have different 6 views about it. We will adjourn until --MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, before adjourn-8 ment, might I state briefly that I have been informed 9 by my associate counsel, Mr. Brown, from the United 10 Kingdom that he has sat on British courts-martial 11 and there is no such provision therein contained. 12 THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until halfpast one. As to the westition under the Churter, the (Whereupon, at 1203, a recess was taken.) sens fig. Re question of the accused's offering thegolf ander this provision of the Charter arises. In is the right of the Tribunel to interrogate if it The sorough HERASUMA must dender forthwith whether he intends to give evidence or not personally. Y ... Calarai warren. MR. WARMEN IT the Eribunel please, the soil point in which defends is in doubt and has been

In doubt is we to whother these words in Section 4, 3

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Reichers & Yelden

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International

Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

energify taking the witness blancy that the

THE PRESIDENT: We give our decision on the application of the Chief of Counsel made just before the luncheon adjournment.

The position on the record is clear. The accused HIRANUMA has not tendered himself as a witness. If he did, he would give his direct testimony and be subject to cross-examination by the prosecution like any other witness.

As to the position under the Charter, the Tribunal will interrogate the accused if and when it sees fit. No question of the accused's offering himself under this provision of the Charter arises. It is the right of the Tribunal to interrogate if it sees fit.

The accused HIRANUMA must decide forthwith whether he intends to give evidence or not personally.

Colonel Warren.

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, the only point in which defense is in doubt and has been in doubt is as to whether these words in Section 4,

Article 11-b, apply only to 11-b or apply to the accused enerally taking the witness stand; that is, to permit comment on his refusal to answer any question. If the accused by not voluntarily offering himself as a witness -- I mean, is an accused, by not voluntarily offering himself as a witness, automatically placed in the category of having refused to answer a question? Upon that point and that point alone hinges the decision which it is my duty to make. As I understand the ruling of the Tribunal, it did not cover that question which has been uppermost in the mind of at least this defense counsel.

If the Tribunal please--

THE PRESIDENT: The question only arises
when he is asked a question and refuses to answer it.
That is the position under 11-b, which reads: "The
Tribunal shall have the power to interrogete each
accused and to permit comment on his refusal to
answer any question."

MR. WARREN: Thank you, your Honor.

May I have just a moment to confer with cocounsel? It will take about thirty seconds.

MR. BROOKS: May I make a further inquiry?

I have a different opinion than Colonel Warren on this point.

I had interpreted the article, 11-b, to mean that the Tribunal shall have the power to interrogate each accused if he takes the witness stand and to permit comment on his refusal to answer any question under those circumstances, but I did not think that the Tribunal had the power to call the accused to the stand if he did not desire to testify and, therefore, would not be allowed to comment upon his refusal to take the stand. Even under the Tribunal's present

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief of Counsel.

ruling that ambiguity still exists.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, I do not know whether the Court is being asked to change its ruling or to extend it or modify it. I see nothing in the Charter that expressly prohibits comment being made on the absence of any witnesses testifying, including the accu. ed. I am informed by learned Associate Counsel from the United Kingdom, from whence many of our own laws in the United States emanated, that until 1898 it was not permitted in that jurisdiction that the accused offer testimony in his own behalf at a trial, and in that jurisdiction when provision was made by law to accord accused that opportunity or privilege it was found advisable, perhaps necessary by inference, to include in the act that there should be no comment

10

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

on the failure of the accused to take the witness stand.

In our own country, Mr. President, the practice of commenting and the prosecution's comment is specifically prohibited and no approach even may be made to drawing the court's or the jury's attention to the fact that the witness has not taken the stand; but, Mr. President, there may be no better time than the present to point out the difference between an international trial and a national trial in this particular respect, that in the preservation of law and order, domestically, nationally or municipally, as it is frequently called, society has the advantage of investigative agencies and the like that operate concurrently with alleged transgressors of the law. No such equivalent has existed during the times we are concerned with and it makes an enormous difference and, I suggest, justifies the broad provisions that exist and undoubtedly do exist in this Charter affording wide latitude in the introduction of evidence and other parts of judicial procedure. And, finally, there will not be, I am sure, the slightest suggestion in history that any effort was made to in any way apply any coercion, force or inducements upon the part of the witnesses to give any

~

23

1

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

testimony at any time, from the beginning of the occupation up until this date and I hope forever afterwards.

THE PRESIDENT: With regard to the point raised by Captain Brooks, that particular provision, article 11-b, would be redundant if it meant only that the Court could interrogate the accused if the accused desired to go into the box to give evidence. If it is not redundant then it means that the accused sitting in the dock can be interrogated by the Tribunal. Now. if, sitting in the dock, accused are interrogated by the Tribunal, if that is what the power is, then their failure to answer can be made the subject of comment. Of course, if they go into the witness box and refuse to answer there is nothing in the Charter that says that the refusal to answer shall not be the subject of comment.

MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, I would like to answer briefly on that point. I think the Tribunal's attention is directed to the first half, rather than the last half of that phrase, and I think it was for the last half that the article was put in, because, as the learned prosecutor has just stated, the right to comment is one which has been so restricted that I believe the Supreme Commander, in drafting this Charter, these articles, said that if the Tribunal interrogates the accused and he refuses to answer then -- this is the important thing -- they will permit comment

on the refusal. That is what this was intended for, and not for the interrogation of the accused itself. The reason for that is plain, if the Tribunal takes into consideration that normally no court would try to force a witness to take the box and testify, because he could say "I don't know," "I don't remember," and it would be a futile thing; and the court could not comment

THE PRESIDENT: If you are right the article in question would be just half as lengthy as it is.

even if he refused to answer in the normal procedure.

MR. BROOKS: That would give it a different meaning entirely, if the Tribunal please. That would then say that they could permit comment in any case, even if he refused to take the box. I say that it limits it. I say this: That the court has this power to interrogate each accused as he takes the box, and permit comment on his refusal to answer when in the box, and no other power besides that.

agree with you, Captain Brooks, because no judge in my country would dare to put a question to an accused in the dock. But we are faced with words which appear plain to me. However, a majority of the Court may take a different view of their meaning. We haven't decided on that yet.

MI. BROOKS: Wh ' I am asking is for the Tribunal to extend its present ruling so that in article 11b they read in and interpret that to state "to interrogate each accused if he takes the witness the witness stood. I might state, stand."

THE PRESIDENT: I may say that, whatever the power is, I personally will not put a question to an accused in the dock.

Colonel Warren.

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, the Court's ruling seems perfectly clear to me and permits me to make up my mind. However, the question raised by Mr. Chief Prosecutor to the effect that the accused, if he did not take the witness stand, there being no prohibition against it, that he might be subject to comment for his failure to do so. It appears to me to be rather far-fetched, and the very statement that he made that it would not be forcing the accused to take the witness stand would be quite the contrary, because that is a distinct edvantage to the prosecution, to be able to comment on the testimony. Me. Declar br. Prosicent, what was well

understood by the prosecution, which will attempt to

keep willis the confined of its own work and realize

that while the brezogutlen can new y speak for the Court

22 23

1

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

MI . BROOKS: Wh ' I am asking is for the Tribunal to extend its present ruling so that in article 11b they read in and interpret that to state "to interrogate each accused if he takes the witness stand."

THE PRESIDENT: I may say that, whatever the power is, I personally will not put a question to an accused in the dock.

Colonel Warren.

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, the Court's ruling seems perfectly clear to me and permits me to make up my mind. However, the question raised by Mr. Chief Prosecutor to the effect that the accused, if he did not take the witness stand, there being no prohibition against it, that he might be subject to comment for his failure to do so. It appears to me to be rather far-fetched, and the very statement that he made that it would not be forcing the accused to take the witness stand would be quite the contrary, because that is a distinct edvantage to the prosecution, to be able to comment on the testimony. . BESTARI Mr. President, What was well

understood by the preservator, shink will attempt to

keep within the confines of its own work and realist

that while the prosecution can power meas for the Court

22 23

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

D 1 1 2 a 3 & 4 Spr a 6 t t 7

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, perhaps we can save some time in this court by a commitment by the prosecution that in its summation it will make no reference whatsoever as to whether an accused does or does not take the witness stand. I might state, Mr. President, that the prosecution feels it is making no substantial concession in so doing, but believes that to be in the interest of fairness. But where evidence is introduced of a hearsay type or evidence is introduced where other evidence is available, it may be from time to time that we will have to advert to that where some inferences could be drawn. We will not mean in that instance to advert to the fact that the witness has not taken the stand. That is all I can say about the matter.

THE PRESIDENT: What the learned Chief of Counsel says, of course, does not touch the position of the Tribunal. We know that he spoke only for the prosecution. We want to make it clear that by our silence we are not subscribing to anything he says as to what part we must play.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, that was well understood by the prosecution, which will attempt to keep within the confines of its own work and realize that while the prosecution can never speak for the Court

many times the Court may find it necessary to direct some phases of the prosecution.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Warren.

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, the ruling of the Court seems to be in absolute accord with my interpretation of the Charter, and we must and will risk the sound discretion of the Court and will pass the case at this time to the next counsel who will continue in the individual phase of the following accused.

MR. PRESIDENT: Captain Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, I am far from satisfied that the ruling of the Court has been made and extended so there is no ambiguity; and there is such a discrepancy among the opinions of the various defense counsel that I would like to have this matter settled if the Court feels fit to extend and pass on this ruling to clear that point up.

THE PRESIDENT: If anything has been left unclear we shall clarify it at the proper time.

Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: May it please the Tribunal, owing to the fact that the accused HIROTA, Koki, does not at present have the benefit of American counsel to present his defense, I respectfully request permission

2 3

to appear as his American counsel <u>pro hac vice</u> for the purpose of presenting the evidence which has been prepared by his other counsel.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not quite follow. What are you going to do for HIROTA? What will you fail to do that his former counsel would have done? Are you going to offer his evidence? Are you going to call his witnesses?

MR. YAMAOKA: Yes, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: You are going to cross-examine or examine them in chief? Are you going to re-examine them? You are going to take his objections?

MR. YAMAOKA: I intend to do that, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: And you are going to sum up,

are you?

MR. YAMAOKA: Well, that has not yet -- I only intend to present his evidence at the present time; and during the course of it, if the witnesses naturally will be called, his other evidence, documentary evidence, will be tendered. If objections are necessary I intend to take them.

THE PRESIDENT: For the time being, so far as we can judge HIROTA has the assistance of American counsel.

Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please your Honor, in my submission it would be desirable to have it quite clear whether my friend, Mr. Yamaoka, is instructed by the accused HIROTA or not. Otherwise --THE PRESIDENT: I do not think he would come to that lectern unless he had HIROTA's authority, which only means instructions. HIROTA is listening to him. I will not insult Mr. YAMAOKA by asking him whether he has HIROTA's authority. MR. YAMAOKA: Thank you, your Honor. Of course, 10 I actually have that authority. 11 THE PRESIDENT: Proceed to read the opening. 12 MR. YAMAOKA: Thank you. 13 Defense document 2571, first on the order or 14 proof, is the opening statement, which will be read in its entirety. Before I commence I desire to state that there . 17 18 have been some corrections noted, and I believe that all the copies distributed to the Tribunal have the corrections noted. So I shall commence reading without making specific corrections at the present time. Mr. President and Members of the Tribunal: 22 We will show by the evidence already introduced 24 into the record which relates solely to events that trans-25 pired while Mr. HIROTA held office and by the production

of documents and the testimony of witnesses the following facts:

1. Mr. HIROTA started his long service as a career diplomat in 1906 and ended his public service in May 1938. He never occupied a military office at any time. His political and diplomatic views and policies during that long period of time were constantly characterized by peace, good will and conciliation among all nations, which were mere expressions of his modest, friendly, sound and steady character, He is one of the most outstanding men ever produced by Japan and has been widely and favorably known throughout Japan and most of the nations of the world as a liberal and progressive man who constantly strove for peaceful relations between Japan and all other nations. He was known and deeply respected both as a diplomat and statesman because of his uniform advocacy of peace and conciliation among nations. Trust and belief in the soundness of his views and policies were the main reasons why he was chosen for the first time as Foreign Minister in 1933. At that time Japan was virtually isolated from the family of nations because of the attitude taken by the League of Nations toward the Manchurian Incident. He was appointed Prime Minister at the time of the internal confusion

9

23

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

in Japan caused by the so-called February 26 Incident which was an army revolt led by officers having no rank higher than captain. The HIROTA policy of conciliation, friendship and good will among all nations stands in contrast to the policy of the previous Foreign Minister Count UCHIDA which had been described as a "scorched earth diplomacy." Though the period between 1932 and 1936 was described as extraordinary because of the aftermath of the Manchurian Incident, it marked a turning point in the relations of Japan with the United States, Great Britain, the Netherlands, etc.; it marked a period of tranquility and showed a gradual improvement of internal and external conditions and relations. The slow but steady progress which Mr. HIROTA had made in his capacity as Foreign Minister and Prime Minister was interrupted by the wholly unexpected Lu-Kow-Chiao Incident of July 7, 1937. The evidence will show beyond doubt that Mr. HIROTA led the all-out and even heroic effort for peace on the part of the Japanese Government which immediately decided upon a policy of local settlement and nonaggrandizement; but, despite the prolonged efforts of the government to bring the incident to a speedy conclusion, the fighting con-25 tinued to spread and what originated as the Lu-Kow-Chiao

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Incident expanded into the so-called China Incident. The evidence will show in detail all the efforts made by the Foreign Office to effectuate peace in China. These efforts were attended by the utmost sincerity and neither Mr. HIROTA nor any other responsible official of the Foreign Office ever entertained any notion of prolonging the affair and certainly no idea of dominating or conquering China or any part of that country. No responsible official in the Foreign Office was ever so naive as to think that Japan could ever successfully dominate the teeming four hundred (400) millions in China. Japan did try to protect the lives and limbs of its nationals and their legitimate property rights in China. It had no other motive as far as the Foreign Office was concerned. The principles and policies which Mr. HIROTA advocated with respect to the China Incident ultimately met opposition from the army and this in turn caused him to resign the post of Foreign Minister in the First KONOYE Cabinet in May 1938 although he had announced his intention to resign as early as February 1938. Since his resignation he never occupied any official office in the executive branch of the government and he had no ambition whatever in that direction.

3

5

7

9

10

12

14

15

17

18

20

21

23

24

2. Mr. HIROTA by nature is endowed with "the spirit of harmony among all nations" by his very words spoken in the Diet on numerous occasions. Throughout his occupancy of high office he always sought to promote conciliation and friendship with other countries of the world. On June 5, 1927 he arrived at the Hague as Japanese Minister to the Netherlands.

Mr. HIROTA was transferred from the Netherlands to be Ambassador to the Soviet Union and during his Ambassadorship he definitely improved the relationship and feeling between the two countries which was accomplished by solving piece by piece the various outstanding problems. After returning to Japan and assuming the office of Foreign Minister he constantly sought to strengthen the friendship and good will between Japan and the Soviet Union. Among other exertions on his part, we point to his efforts as mediator in the negotiations whereby the Soviet Union sold the Chinese Eastern Railway to Manchukuo, the negotiations having extended over a eriod of nineteen (19) months in Tokyo before the formal transfer and sale was signed in March 1935. The interest of Mr. HIROTA in acting as mediator was actuated solely by his effort to remove a potential

24

1

3

5

. 6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

.64

Reilway connected with the South Manchurian Railroad and was an important traffic link between the East and Western Europe. Even Litvinov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs, expressed deep gratification for the patient services of Mr. HIROTA as mediator during the long negotiations. Nothing in connection with the negotiations for the sale, which will be shown in detail, even intimates any pressure by Japan in the negotiations. The fact is that the Soviet Union suggested the idea of sale of the railway to either Manchukuo or Japan and the Soviet Union seemed to be as glad to remove a potential source of friction as was the Japanese Government.

to how and a Herenday This said or open on lective than

to bed and attributed the programmine and questional of the

er smallet coverages wasco or area freely-an threat the

Core of severations named to by all nations operations

hard for Albert spinely regions, commenter moveyment, one

the Soules Thina, shippings the opinion was wisely much

desperter Intersections to mat the

in Mapon in 1300, especially exter the Savert Car

in the so-estim continuestic egites. The fati-Gentries

the department form of preparations as well as to her

was personally in favor of the conclusion of a nonaggression treaty as proposed by the Soviet Union
during his tenure as Ambassador to Russia; upon his
return from Moscow he transmitted the suggestion of
the Soviet Union to Foreign Minister UCHIDA. The
reply of the Japanese Government to that suggestion
was sent to the Soviet Union ouring the period when
Mr. HIROTA was in retirement, he having returned to
Japan from loscow in late 1932 and had been in the
status of retirement and on pension until he was
unexpectedly called to the post of Foreign Minister
in the SAITO Cabinet in September 1933.

cluded between Japan and Germany during the HIROTA
Cabinet in November 1936 had no other objective than
to defend against the progressive encroachment of the
or munist movements which offered imminent threat to
the Japanese form of government as well as to the
form of government maintained by all nations operating
on the so-called capitalistic system. The Anti-Cominter
Pact was aimed solely against communist movements, not
the Soviet Union, although the opinion was widely held
in Japan in 1936, especially after the Seventh Convention of the Communist Internationale, that the

.

Communist Internationale and the Soviet Union in their real objectives were one and the same thing. The Anti-Comintern Pact did not change the intention of Mr. HIROTA and the Japanese Government to maintain friendly relations between the two states. The pact was not a "first step" in the direction of a military alliance with Germany and neither Mr. HIROTA nor any other responsible person in the Japanese Government in 1936 entertained any such fantastic notion. The evidence will further show that no man in Japan ever worked harder to promote friendly relations between Japan and the Soviet Union.

5. The effort on the part of the prosecution to show by the KASAHARA manuscript that Mr. HIROTA entertained anti-Soviet ideas is a paper with respect to which Mr. HIROTA knows nothing. Part of the transcript will be referred to in which the same witness testified that the content of said manuscript, which is almost undecipherable, is contrary to what Mr. HIROTA used to express as his opinion with respect to th relations with the Soviet Union.

6. The evidence will further show that the Chinese policy of Mr. HIROTA was based entirely on the spirit of harmony, conciliation, compromise, and peace at almost any dignified price. Here again the

evidence will show thet no man in the recent history of Japan ever worked harder to bring about a rapprochement in the relations between Japan and China which were strained both before and after the Manchurian Incident. The atmosphere surrounding the relation between China and Japan while Count UCHIDA was Foreign Minister was gloomy in the extreme. Mr. HIROTA exerted his utmost efforts in improving the relationship between the two countries as soon as he assumed the post of Foreign Minister and extended to China on many occasions directly and in addresses before the Diet the open hand of friendship and understanding. The evidence will show that during his occupancy of high office various pending problems between Japan and China were solved and new steps were effected to promote cooperation between the two countries. Thus in the early part of 1934 negotiations were started between the Minister to China ARIYOSHI and Mr. Wang Ching-wei, President of the Executive Yuan and concurrently Foreign Minister of the Nationalist Government, for the purpose of fundamentally and radically improving the relations between Japan and China. These negotiations progressed smoothly and as a result Mr. HIROTA made a statement to that effect in the Diet on January 22, 1935; following this statement, on

19

2

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

22

23

~

February 20, 1935, Mr. Wang Ching-wei made a statement along the same line as the foregoing. On March 2, 1935, Mr. Chiang Kai-shek endorsed the foregoing statement by Mr. Wang Ching-wei. Moreover, the Japanese Government had recognized the Chiang Kai-shek regime and Mr. HIROTA was deeply interested in the tedious efforts of Chiang Kai-shek to bring internal order, unity and stability to China. In May 1935, in an effort to strengthen and promote sentiment and good feeling between Japan and China, the existing legations in both Japan and China were elevated to the status of embassies.

"In an effort to materialize the abovementioned Sino-Japanese relations, the Japanese Government, on October 4, 1935, decided its Chinese policy.

This policy was formulated along lines of the wishes
of Mr. Wang Ching-wei. The so-called "HIROTA's Three
Principles," with respect to China, were made public
through Foreign Minister HIROTA's speech in the
Imperial Diet on January 21, 1936, and this statement
to the Diet with respect to the Chinese policy was
identical in substance with the policy decided by the
Japanese Government on October 4, 1935.

7. Mr. HIROTA has always maintained a firm belief that in view of the poverty of resources and

economic weakness of Japan the progress of Japan was impossible without the cooperation and friendship of the United States, Great Britain, the Netherlands and China; and his friendship for and cooperation with those countries to the utmost could be said to be the cornerstone and real basis of his diplomacy. He sought to persuade Great Britain to join the Anti-Comintern Pact or a pact of similar nature which would strengthen the ties. Although Great Britain refused to join the pact he kept fending off the frequent proposals of Italy to join the Anti-Comintern Pact solely because of fear Great Britain would not understand the motive and that reaction in Great Britain would work to the deterioration of friendly relations.

8. His bold bid for cooperation and better understanding was manifested in one form by the exchange of notes between Mr. HIROTA and Mr. Hull in February 1934. Numerous addresses made by him in the Imperial Diet will be of tremendous assistance in showing his straightforward statement of his beliefs and views. His assertion in the Diet of 1935 that "there will be no war while I remain in office" is illustrative of his determination as a diplomat and statesman. In view of the autonomous character of the army and navy under the Japanese Constitution the

24

25

1

3

4

5

8

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Tribunal will readily recognize the courage manifested in the foregoing statement.

9. The prosecution has contended, with all the benefit of hindsight, that though the utterances of Mr. HIROTA with respect to relations with foreign powers were conciliatory, his actual policies and their results were of a different nature. By nature Mr. HIROTA is not given to mental duplicity or craftiness. The evidence will show that where the result turned out to be different from the course Mr. HIROTA charted the result was caused by circumstances entirely beyond his control. He resigned his last public office in May 1938 with the full realization of the fruitlessness of all his long efforts. He had the unhappy experience of being called to high office in Japan during a period of extreme distress in both internal and external affairs and while he worked with great fervor to right both internal and external unbalance, he lived to see all the ideals and objectives he worked so hard to achieve fall in ruins about him. A large part of the evidence will relate to the efforts on the part of Mr. HIROTA in the face of such situations and it is intended by this means, in part, to refute the existence of a common plan or conspiracy to accomplish any of the objectives set forth in the alleged

3

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Indictment and to make it crystal clear that he is not guilty of an individual crime with respect to any count in the alleged Indictment relating to him.

10. When Mr. HIROTA assumed the post of Foreign Minister for the first time, Manchoukuo had already been recognized as an independent state by Japan and the relationship between the two countries was considered an accomplished fact which did not lay within he power of any one man in Japan to easily change. The evidence will show that all Mr. HIROTA could do in those circumstances was to labor to improve 12 within limits compatible with the new situation the relationship between Japan on one side and China and other powers on the other which, as previously stated, had become sorely aggravated because of the Manchurian Incident and the rise of the Manchoukuo Government. Evidence already in the case and to be further demon-17 strated will show that his efforts resulted progressively 18 in removing all factors on the basis of which third 19 powers contended that Manchoukuo was something less than a sovereign and independent state. Witness his 21 successful effort to establish in 1935 the joint econo-22 mic cor ission between Japan and Manchoukuo with an 23 24 equal number of representatives on each side and the surrender of all extraterritorial rights in favor of 25

1

Manchoukuo in 1937. His efforts consisted in

4

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

conscientious adjustment of those situations.

11. In representations by the United States, Japan w s sought to be held responsible for economic measures adopted by Manchoukuo such as the so-called petroleum monopoly in Manchoukuo and in other respects. The Foreign Ministry found it impossible to give full satisfaction to these complaints without fundamentally denying the independence of Manchoukuo which, as previously stated, had been recognized by the Japanese Government, before the days when Mr. HIROTA came to office, as a sovereign and independent state fully capable of dealing with its own internal and external problems in its own right.

Wolf & Lefler

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

On July 7, 1937, the Lu-Kow-Chiao 12. Incident suddenly broke out. It was on July 8, 1937 when telegraphic information to that effect first reached the Foreign Office. Mr. HIROTA was resting at his country home at the time in Kugenuma, Kanagawa Prefecture, without the slightest knowledge, much less forethought, of this Incident. On July 9 an extraordinary Cabinet meeting was held at which the policy of non-aggrandizement and speedy local settlement of the Incident was firmly decided upon and Mr. HIROTA took the initiative on that occasion. That policy was immediately transmitted from the Foreign Office to the Japanese Ambassador and Consuls in China and the Army and Navy transmitted the same instruction to their respective units in China. On July 11 a plan for preliminary preparation for mobilization was proposed by the Army and for this purpose an urgent Cabinet meeting was summoned; Foreign Minister HIROTA opposed the idea of the Army for an immediate adoption of the mobilization plan. However, on that occasion War Minister SUGIYAMA explained that the proposed plan for preliminary preparation for mobilization did not mean an immediate start of preparation for mobilization of home divisions, but was intended only to decide preliminary for the start of

22

24

preparation for mobilization in case the situation in China should be aggravated by chance in the near future, and SUGIYAMA went on to explain that without this preliminary understanding he could not be held responsible for the protection of the Army itself on the spot, the numerous Japanese residents in China, as well as important Japanese vested interests, in view of the smallness of the Japanese force on the spot which numbered only five thousand men. Upon 10 this explanation, the Cabinet gave its approval to 11 this preliminary Army plan with the understanding that 12 the preparation for mobilization would be halted 13 immediately in case negotiations for local settlement and restoration of peace were successful. occasion and at the insistence of Mr. HIROTA he made the understanding doubly sure that, even in case an 16 Army should be dispatched in this connection, the 17 18 object would be for the sole purpose of protecting 19 Japanese residents and forces in China. 20

On July 11, 1937, Mr. HIROTA asked the Chinese Charge d'Affaires to come to the Foreign Office and there explained to him the necessity for a speedy local settlement. On the same day he sent an instruction to Councillor of the Embassy HIDAKA to make the same statement to the Chinese Department of Foreign

24

21

22

preparation for mobilization in case the situation in China should be aggravated by chance in the near future, and SUGIYAMA went on to explain that without this preliminary understanding he could not be held responsible for the protection of the Army itself on the spot, the numerous Japanese residents in China, as well as important Japanese vested interests, in view of the smallness of the Japanese force on the spot which numbered only five thousand men. Upon this explanation, the Cabinet gave its approval to this preliminary Army plan with the understanding that the preparation for mobilization would be halted immediately in case negotiations for local settlement and restoration of peace were successful. occasion and at the insistence of Mr. HIROTA he made the understanding doubly sure that, even in case an Army should be dispatched in this connection, the 18 object would be for the sole purpose of protecting 19 Japanese residents and forces in China. 20

13. On July 11, 1937, Mr. HIROTA asked the Chinese Charge d'Affaires to come to the Foreign Office and there explained to him the necessity for a speedy local settlement. On the same day he sent an instruction to Councillor of the Embassy HIDAKA to make the same statement to the Chinese Department of Foreign

U

21

22

23

Affairs. A local settlement was reached on the night of the same day. However, the situation shortly became aggravated as the Nanking Government started the brisk movement of huge numbers of troops to the north. In the face of this alarming development and increasing incidents between Chinese and Japanese troops in North China and in view of the general background and situation within China itself, the Cabinet, on July 20, 1937, approved preparation for mobilization of three home divisions in compliance with the Cabinet decision of July 11, as previously stated. Even in the face of that tense situation Mr. HIROTA did not abandon in the least his hope for a peaceful solution and he ordered Councillor HIDAKA to continue the negotiation with the Chinese which resulted in an agreement with Mr. Chang Chun, Governor of Su Chuan Province, providing for the mutual withdrawal of troops from the troubled areas. The Japanese Cabinet decision of non-reparation and non-annexation arrived at in the early part of 1937 was self described by Mr. HIROTA as being so wholesome that "the whole world would pay respect to the fair and unselfish attitude of the Japanese Empire." Negotiations based upon those principles were conducted between Ambassador KAWAGOE and Mr. Kao Tsun-Wu, Director of the Chinese Bureau of

2

20

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

Asiatic Affairs. At the same time Consul-General OKAMOTO exerted strenuous efforts on instruction from the Foreign Ministry for the maintenance of peace in the Shanghai district. Not being satisfied with the effectiveness of these official negotiations, Mr. HIROTA dispatched Mr. ARITA, Hachiro, former Foreign Minister, and Mr. FUNATSU, Shinichiro, to China to work for peace among influential Chinese personalities behind the scenes. On October 1, 1937, the basic policies for dealing with the China Incident were decided among the four Minister, that is to say, the Prime Minister, Foreign Minister, War Minister and Navy Minister; there it was sincerely decided to seek a solution upon the broad principle to end the Incident as soon as possible, to adhere to international laws, to limit the combat zones roughly to the Hopei, Chahar and the Shanghai districts and so solve the problem of North China by assisting in whatever way might be possible in placing that district under the firm administration of the Chinese Nationalist Government. On October 20 and November 7, 1937, the Belgian Government invited the Japanese Government to participate in the Brussels Conference in connection with the China Incident but it was unable to accept the invitation. Evidence will be offered to show that the

.

20

19

8

12

13

15

17

22

non-acceptance of this invitation did not constitute a breach of the Nine-Power Treaty. Moreover, strong and decisive elements in Japan were wary about acceptance of an invitation to the Brussels Conference because of apprehension that its ultimate decision had already been cut and dried and that nothing short of direct negotiations between the Chinese and Japanese would bring an end to the basic conditions which lay at the root of all difficulties between China and Japan for many years. Nothing the Foreign Minister could do would have altered that attitude in the least. However, Foreign Minister HIROTA met Sir Robert Craigie, the British Ambassador, frequently after the latter's arrival in Japan in 1937 and asked the good offices of his Government for the realization of peace between Japan and China.

LEGIZ asked will to in so Howevery Ship affort on the

ports of Mr. Bindta ske not accept as propular of chication

cedars by the kroy Labor, the Army bearn to advantage

the most without of Germany, Mr. Mikely mentioned to

with the tracking the large to doubted him the tracking of the

some office an Dermany bug only a total votage in thinks

about the election of a Sie Robert Cradela, Station tobaccate

promped to Service Statem Render Render dee was of the combined

17

1

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

22

23

24

On October 27, 1937, Mr. HIROTA held an inter-1 view with the Ambassadors of Great Britain, the United 2 States, Germany and Italy and told them frankly that the Japanese Government would warmly welcome any action by any of the above-mentioned four powers to take the initiative in introducing peace in China and to act as intermediary in any peace negotiations, the negotiations to be based solely upon the simple and non-aggressive principles expressed in the draft decision reached in the early part of August 1937 among the four Ministries mentioned above; all this notwithstanding the fact that Japan was not in a position to accept the invitation to the Brussels Conference. In response to this Sir Robert Craigie, British Ambassador, visited Foreign Minister HIROTA soon thereafter and informed him of the readiness on the part of Great Britain to take the initiative and to act as intermediary between China and Japan. Mr. 18 HIROTA asked him to do so. However, this effort on the 19 part of Mr. HIROTA did not progress because of objection raised by the Army. Later, the Army began to advocate the good offices of Germany. Mr. HIROTA hesitated to ask Germany because he doubted the effectiveness of its 22 good offices as Germany had only a weak voice in China. 23 About the same time Sir Robert Craigie, British Ambassador, 24 proposed to Foreign Minister HIROTA the use of the combined 25

10

11

good offices of Great Britain, the United States and
Germany and it will be shown that Mr. HIROTA was
greatly interested in that proposal; however, it did
not materialize on account of an objection from the
Army and the lack of enthusiasm on the part of Germany
in the use of its good offices in a joint effort with
Great Britain and the United States.

In December 1937, Von Dirksen, the German Ambassador, informed Foreign Minister HIROTA of the readiness of Germany to render good offices and he inquired about the Japanese terms. Mr. HIROTA intended to make the terms decided in the early part of August 1937 the basis for the proposed negotiations and Mr. HIROTA thought at that time there would be no objection on the part of the Army. However, as the liaison conference had been set up immediately preceding this occasion, the question was left to the final consideration of the liaison conference. On the other hand, Nanking fell on December 13, 1937, and as a result the general public and press in Japan favored a stronger China policy. At the liaison conference in December 1937 the opinions of Foreign Minister HIROTA and others were not accepted and there were various heated arguments on that occasion. The upshot of the liaison conference was the insistence on stronger terms of peace for China than the terms

3

6

8

9

11

13

14

16 17

18

20

21

22

24

agreed upon in the early part of August 1937. Additionally, the Nationalist Government of China was expected to make an answer to the new proposal by the fifth or sixth of January of the following year. Mr. HIROTA showed the newly decided basic terms to the German Ambassador and gave him minute and detailed explanations. The German Ambassador presented the terms to the Chinese side but the answer from the Chinese side was not forthcoming until January 14, 1938. The answer of the Chinese requesting more picayune details which had already been fully explained by Von Dirksen to them was regarded by the Japanese Government as exhibiting an inclination to protract the negotiations and in general as exhibiting an attitude of procrastination. The whole setup and complexion with respect to Chinese bona fides caused a deep feeling among the Cabinet that Chiang Kai-shek was using the occasion for the strategic purpose of rallying all China behind his banner and the anti-Japanism front. Thus, on January 16, 1938, the Japanese Government issue? a statement "hereafter not to deal with the Nationalist Government." In this manner, the First KONOYE Cabinet discontinued peace negotiations with the Nationalist Government but insofar only as the formal aspect of the negotiations were concerned. Nevertheless, even at this stare and with the fighting in China constantly

2

5

8

7

10

11

13

14

16 17

18

19

20

22

23

spreading, Mr. HIROTA did not give up his hope of negotiating a peaceful settlement with the Nationalist Government; and in the spring of 1938, he was in contact 4 with the Nationalist Government which was then in Hankow 5 with respect to the problem of a durable peace. In short, it was the consistent and earnest desire of Foreign Minister HIROTA to restore peace in the speediest possible manner with China on the most reasonable and conciliatory terms; and he was at his wit's end in dealing with this intricate situation to prevent the spread of the Incident ever since it broke out on July 7, 1937. The evidence will show that he exerted his best efforts toward that end throughout his tenure of office and until the day he resigned from the First KONOYE Cabinet in May 1938, he held high and almost prayerful hope that peace would reign. However, as the war progressed in favor of Japanese forces his position in the Cabinet became extremely shaky and difficult because of consistent adherence to his mild and conciliatory principles and ideas in dealing with the Chinese. This fact was recognized by Ambassador Grew as early as October 30, 1937. Thus Mr. HIROTA expressed his desire to resign while the Diet was in session in February 1938; but his resignation was not so simple because of his extraordinar sense of responsibility and the actual tug in politics

19

20

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

21

23

inasmuch as he joined the First KONOYE Cabinet at the ardent request of and support of the so-called sound and liberal faction represented by the last Genro, the late Prince SAIONJI, and others. Mr. HIROTA having occupied the topmost position of Prime Minister was most reluctant to accept a lesser office in the First KONOYE Cabinet and did so only at the earnest request of Prince SAIONJI who entertained the opinion that Mr. HIROTA would lend strength and balance to the First KONOYE Cabinet. THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen 11 12 13 (Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was 14 taken until 1500, after which the proceed-15 ings were resumed as follows:) 16 best so planted by the develope Covernment and settleday to motain angitaripants to the Pagi wolely assert the

Social Starting Atatoms Japan noward strategies to the

thet make of a the States to the month weits fire the

Invier Thise. The swidting will show that the Bethale

procedure for the merpone of spectrum their williams

Wer, String had no edge or the objection

17

18

19 20

21

22

K a 2 p 2

e 4 a 5

K 7 n 8 p 9

12 13

10

11

15 16

17

14

18

20

19

21

23

24

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.
THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: May it please the Tribunal, I will continue with paragraph 14 of the opening statement:

14. The Anti-Comintern Pact between Japan and Germany was a means for defense against Communistic movements in so far as its external aspect was concerned; internally speaking it was aimed, among other purposes, to alleviate one aspect of the insecure feeling of the Japanese arising out of its virtual international isolation since the Manchurian Incident and confrontation with the cold attitude of the League of Nations and the United States. The Anti-Comintern Pact as planned by the Japanese Government did not aim to obtain participants to the Pact solely among totalitarian States; Japan sought adherence to the Pact among all the States in the world aside from the Soviet Union. The evidence will show that the Netherlands, Great Britain and others were sincerely approached for the purpose of securing their adherence to the principles of the Pact.

Mr. HIROTA had no connection whatsoever with the

conclusion of the Tripartite Pact and that during the YONAI Government he, in his unofficial capacity as so-called State Counsellor, advised Mr. YONAI against participation in any such military alliance. The evidence will show that after Mr. MATSUOKA negotiated the Tripartite Pact, Mr. HIROTA, in his capacity as a private citizen, talked and argued against it and stated that MATSUOKA was following a course "fatal to Japan." As previously stated, Mr. HIROTA always maintained the firm conviction that the future of Japan lay in close cooperation with the United States, Great Britain and the Netherlands. He was deeply disturbed that the Tripartite Pact would only result in increasingly bad relations between Japan and the United States and Great Britain.

tion laws for the War Ministry and Navy Ministry which followed the February 26 Incident by the terms of which qualification for the offices of Ministers and Vice-Ministers were limited to Generals and Admirals on the active list did not alter one iota the existing immemorial custom and usage under which only those on the active list were appointed to the posts of Ministers and Vice-Ministers. The circumstances surrounding the revision of those laws have already been

as court exhibit No. 2366, who was unable to testify in person because of illness at that time, will appear as a witness in this phase of the case. Additional evidence will be introduced to show actual examples in which attempts were made to form a cabinet by appointing a retired General to the post of War Minister after recall to active service.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

17. The steps taken by Mr. HIROTA in connection with the naval negotiations of 1934, such as the abrogation of the Washington Naval Treaty and others, do not constitute violation of any treaty obligations or principle of international law. Mr. HIROTA was a leader in thought in Japanese Government for general naval disarmament, abolition of offensive equipment and the principle of "non-menace and non-aggression" among all nations. As late as 1938, Mr. HIROTA stated that the time might be ripe to call a new limitation conference of the powers. The Court will recall evidence already introduced by the prosecution that upon the failure of those naval limitation agreements Mr. HIROTA assured all the powers that the absence of agreements did not mean that Japan would engage in a naval construction race.

The prosecution erroneously contended that

Mr. HIROTA assumed the post of President of the Board of Planning; it was not the Board of Planning, but the Bureau of Planning to which he was appointed as President. The Bureau of Planning was exclusively engaged in studies and preparations for the establishment of the Welfare Ministry and he held that office from June 10 to October 24, 1937, although he seldom attended meetings. The Bureau of Planning did not deal with any other important business. This evidence will show that he had nothing to do with the Army five-year plan, other five-year plans discussed in the evidence, or with any plans to increase the strength of the

nation for war purposes.

not hold any responsible position after his resignation from the Government as Foreign Minister in the First KONOYE Cabinet in May, 1938. Therefore, there is no ground for holding him legally responsible for the decisions and steps taken by the Government at any time since May, 1938. He was a Cabinet Counsellor under the YONAI Cabinet, but a Counsellor had no other responsibility than to express advisory opinions in response to inquiries if and when the Government saw fit to ask for such opinions. Mr. HIROTA was treated under Japanese custom as a so-called "Elder

Statesman" along with other persons who had held the position of Prime Minister, and his opinion was sometimes sought concerning special political problems, more particularly with respect to the choice of the candidate for Prime Minister in case of a cabinet change. Mr. HIROTA approved the recommendation of General 'JO at the time the Third KONOYE Cabinet resigned because he trusted Marquis KIDO's opinion that General TOJO was a suitable person for the purpose of reconsidering the decisions made by the Imperial Conference held on September 6, 1941. Mr. HIROTA did not know General TOJO at that time and had no knowledge of what kind of a person he was. Mr. HIROTA agreed with the opinions expressed by Marquis KIDO who was then Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal. Moreover, Mr. HIROTA understood at the time that the TOJO Cabinet would continue with sincerity its efforts for the restoration of normal relations between the United States, Great Britain, the Netherlands, etc., and he had no thought whatever at the time he agreed with Marquis . IDO's opinion that war would transpire on December 7, 1941. Mr. HIROTA's opinion, expressed at the Imperial Conference held on November 29, 1941, when he was summoned as one of the "Elder Statesmen," called for "diplomacy first," and is sufficient in

2

1

4 5

6

8

10

11

13

14

16

18

19

21

22

24

itself to prove that even at the eleventh hour and when the existing government was of the opinion that war was "inevitable" he stood out as a bulwark in his consistent and lifelong advocacy of peace and conciliation. It will be clear to all those who have a correct understanding of Marquis KIDO's diary that Mr. HIROTA did all which lay in his power to avoid a conflict between Japan and the United States, Great Britain and the Netherlands.

20. Thus it will appear that Mr. HIROTA had no part in or power to control the Pacific War or anything to do with what transpired in connection therewith; no part in the negotiation for or conclusion of the Tripartite Pact; nothing whatever to do with the landing of troops in French Indo-China, the arbitration of the boundary disputes between French Indo-China and Thailand; and nothing to do with the border clashes between Japanese and Russian troops in Manchuria. Mr. HIROTA has never entertained the thought or said or done anything whatever which would indicate that he either individually or in connection with a common plan or conspiracy sought Japanese domination of the world or any part thereof or any race or people living therein.

The evidence will also show that complaints

lodged with the Japanese Foreign Office by foreign governments received unprecedentedly prompt attention and answer. The prompt, humble and apologetic attitude assumed by Mr. HIROTA and the Japanese Government upon the happening of the "Panay" and "Ladybird" accidents in Chinese waters and prompt payment of indemnities in connection therewith are all attributable to Mr. HIROTA. The evidence will show that no man who ever occupied the Foreign Office was more disturbed about those incidents and others which occurred in China during the course of large-scale hostilities because they, in the estimation of Mr. HIROTA and the responsible officials of the United States and Great Britain, seemed to offer an imminent threat to good relations between those countries and the possibility of undoing in moments of emotion and passion on the part of foreign governments of everything Mr. HIROTA had worked so assiduously to build up during his years in office. Even when Mr. Grew, the American Ambassador, transmitted to the Foreign Office complaints of religious and other groups in Nanking about atrocities committed in Nanking by Japanese troops on and after December 13, 1937, Mr. HIROTA, without knowledge as to whether those reports were true or false, accepted those reports from the standpoint of the Foreign

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Officials to take the complaints up with the War
Minister who was to make appropriate representations
to the Supreme Command of the Army; the evidence will
show that Mr. HIROTA personally remonstrated in this
connection and that the Army took action to the extent of making appropriate investigations and sending
a special Army representative to Nanking in that connection. As the Foreign Minister had no control whatsoever over the activities of the Supreme Command,
this was all that any Foreign Minister could be expected to do and actually could do under the Constitution of Japan.

with such slogans as "New Order" or the "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere." Although some quarters in Japan maintained that the Nine-Power Pact had been a dead letter since 1930 because of the Chinese action in unilaterally denouncing all extraterritorial rights in China and that the Pact was impractical in operation, Mr. HIROTA always assured the third powers that their rights in China under the Nine-Power Pact would be scrupulously observed by Japan; Mr. HIROTA was honest and sincere in those representations and all instruct ons emanating from the Foreign Office

warned Janese authorities that the rights of third powers must be carefully observed.

have been able to discover up to this stage the point sought to be made by the prosecution in his relation to the counts of the alleged Indictment. Hence, counsel are necessarily driven to introducing evidence relating to the topics unraveled by the prosecution. The defendant now goes forward with additional evidence and upon the conclusion of the presentation of all the evidence in the case the defendant will most respectfully move this Honorable Tribunal to return a finding of not guilty upon each and every count of the alleged Indictment affecting him.

either being prepared in foreign countries or are now en route to Japan. If this evidence does not arrive before the conclusion of the evidence on behalf of Mr. HIROTA, the defendant requests the privilege of introducing such evidence at a later stage of this trial.

All of which is most respectfully submitted.

MR. YAMAOKA: We now offer in evidence defense document 2467. This is the affidavit of former American Ambassador Joseph C. Grew, who served in Tokyo from 1931 to 1942 continuously. This affidavit is an important piece of evidence and shows that Fr. HIROTA was always wholly opposed to war and exerted his best efforts to avoid war. The affidavit further shows that Mr. HIROTA was fundamentally opposed to many of the policies and actions of other Japanese, especially the policies and actions which ultimately led to war with the United States and other members of the United Nations, and that Mr. Grew observed from time to time actions by Mr. HIROTA tending to arrest the alleged expansionist movement of In this connection the Court will recall the previous request that Mr. Grew be called as a witness, and it now appearing that his presence as a witness will not be ordered by the Tribunal, this affidavit is offered as next best evidence of the facts which Mr. HIROTA would seek to prove had Mr. Grew been produced as a witness.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal, the prosecution objects to this document, which was rejected yesterday when tendered on behalf of HIRANUMA. In tendering it my learned friend has already read the whole of it so far as it affects HIROTA, and in our sub-

ĕ

*

21

2

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

mission it is obviously nothing but opinion and character evidence.

THE FRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, it is realized that yesterday afternoon this affidavit was rejected. Notwithstanding, in the light of the reservation made yesterday, I desire to point out that it was drawn by a person not versed in the law and consequently may not conform to the rulings of this Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I should like to reserve the right, and request respectfully the permission of the Tribunal, to offer at a later stage a revised affidavit which will conform to the rulings of the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: "Te note what you say.

MR. YAMAOKA: I particularly desire to point out that since Ambassador Grew is not available and we cannot avail ourselves of the opportunity of having his testimony, which we feel would be very favorable to the accused HIROTA, we desire to have the permission of the Tribunal to present a proper affidavit later.

THE PRESIDENT: We give you the same concession as we made in the case of HATA.

MR. YAMAOKA: Thank you, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, I wish to make the same reservation I made yesterday.

MR. YAMAOKA: We now offer in evidence defense document 2468. This is an affidavit by former American Ambassador Joseph C. Grew. The affidavit verifies a large number of excerpts taken from the diary of Mr. Crew kept in Japan and entitled "Ten Years in Japan." The excerpts incorporated into the affidavit, which will be read hereafter separately, constitute important evidence of the attitude and actions taken by Mr. HIROTA during his term of office as Foreign Minister and Prime Minister for the promotion of peace between Japan and all foreign countries.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: If it please the Tribunal, the prosecution objects to this document. If any of the documents referred to are in themselves material and proper to be admitted in evidence, the prosecution has never taken any objection to them merely on the ground that they are not verified by affidavit. We shall have to object to them on other grounds when they are tendered, and the affidavit will not carry the matter any further one way or the other.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, in reply I should desire to state that there has been considerable objection taken by the prosecution to the excerpts from Mr. Grew's diary "Ten Years in Japan" on various grounds, and in order to obviate such objections and out of an abundance of caution, this affidavit was obtained from Mr. Grew.

THE PRESIDENT: The effect of this affidavit is that Mr. Grew says that he wrote that book and that these excerpts from it express the truth in his belief. That is not contested. There is no contest about that; we understand, so this affidavit is unnecessary and may be withdrawn.

MR. YAMAOKA: It does, if your Honor please, mention that the excerpts are based either upon personal knowledge or information, which I believe are --

THE PRESIDENT: If you press it we will have to take the opinion of the Judges. It does not appear to be necessary.

MR. YAMAOKA: Well, as it appears that there is no contest about this, and as the objection will probably be raised as the excerpts are offered, I will, then, withdraw this tender.

Next on the order of proof is defense document
2469. I desire to withdraw this document.

We offer in evidence defense document 2225.

The Soviet section of the prosecution sought to leave the inference that Mr. HIROTA showed an anti-Soviet attitude by refusal to look with favor upon a Japanese-Soviet non-aggression pact. For the purpose of showing the contrary this document is offered to show a statement made by Mr. HIROTA on October 15, 1932, and recorded in the newspaper Tokyo Asahi Shimbun.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document. It is a newspaper report of a statement by HIROTA. In the first place, it is not the best evidence available. In the second place, it is a self-serving declaration in so far as it could be said to be relevant at all. Almost the whole of the first page can be said to consist of HIROTA's demands on Russia, which, it is submitted, is irrelevant.

On the second page the paragraph which fills almost a whole page contains, in the submission of the prosecution, only one or two sentences which are not clearly mere opinion, starting in the middle from "When Mr. YOSHIZAWA, former Foreign Minister, called at Moscow" down to the end of the next sentence, reading "on this problem." It is submitted that every other part of that page is mere opinion. For these reasons the prosecution objects to this document.

4 5

7 8

1 2 e n 3 4 e r 5 g 6 & 7 B 9 10 11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please, in reply to the learned prosecutor I should desire to point out that during the prosecution's case I made a rough survey, and I believe that they have introduced into evidence about thirty-eight news articles and various other press releases. I don't believe that the mere fact that this is a newspaper article in and of itself is a valid objection if it correctly reports what the accused HIROTA said. And I might add that a perusal of some of the prosecution documents will show that excerpts from this very paper, the Tokyo Asahi Shimbun, have been admitted as evidence during the prosecution's case. My associate reminds me that just recently, the day before yesterday, during the cross-examination of Mr. YONAI, such an excerpt was admitted.

As to the second ground, this shows very definitely what HIROTA's attitude was vis-a-vis Russia.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Tribunal sustains the objection to the extent of the second and third paragraphs. The balance is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2225 will receive exhibit No. 3232.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit
No. 3232 and received in evidence.)

NR. YAMAOKA: I shall then read exhibit
3232 with the deletions as ordered by the Tribunal:

"October 15, 1932 issue of
Tokyo Asahi Shimbun
"(No. 16692)"

I shall omit the title.

"Koki HIROTA, Ambassador at Moscow, arrived in Tokyo on Friday (14th) at 8:25 p.m. Interviewed by our reporter on the train, the Ambassador made the following remarks on the most recent state of affairs in soviet Russia and her relations with Japan and Manchukuo after the creation of the new empire, particularly on Russia's Far Eastern diplomatic policy centering around the non-aggression pact.

"'Japan's despatch of troops to Manchuria' since the outbreak of the Manchurian Incident last autumn gave a temporary shock to Russia, who concentrated a considerable military strength on the Soviet-Manchurian boundary. At that time Russia appears to have confronted serious financial and other difficulties. There seems to be afloat a rumor in Japan that Russia is at the bottom of the recent

Manchuli Incident. This is an instance of being afraid of one's own shadow -- a thing which a great nation should be ashamed of.'"

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I apologize for interrupting, but is this in accordance with the Court's ruling? There is doubt as to whether the paragraphs are those underlined or whether they are the paragraphs on the first page.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no mistake about it, Mr. Brown. I stated what the Court had decided to do.

MR. YAMAOKA: Then proceeding from where I stopped:

to make previous arrangements for peaceful settlement of any possible dispute with her neighbors. This is reflected in her apparent intention to conclude a non-aggression pact with Japan and Manchukuo. When Mr. YOSHIZAWA, former Foreign Minister, called at Moscow, Messrs. Karakhan and Litvinov advanced an earnest proposal for the conclusion of a similar pact, subsequently declaring the same intention as occasion demanded. I believe Ambassador Troyanovsky has undertaken negotiations in Tokyo on this problem. Appre-

1 2

hensions are entertained in some quarters that even if Russia may conclude such pact with Japan, she will attempt aggression in the form of ideological warfare, but there is no need of such apprehensions. For instance, Italy, who is strongly averse to Communism, has concluded a non-aggression pact with Russia, but no trouble has arisen between the two powers. In Italy red propaganda is strictly prohibited, anyone who launches it being instantly executed by shooting. In Germany the existence of Communists is officially admitted and yet the very fact has not put an end to disputes with Russia. In my opinion, Japan may also conclude the same pact if it is calculated to bring some benefit to Japan.

"Recognition of Manchukuo: 'It is meaningless for Russia to conclude a non-aggression pact with Manchukuo. The other party to the pact ought to be Japan. Soviet Russia has given de facto recognition to Manchukuo. She not only desires to have a Manchukuan ccasul stationed in Moscow but also suggests that the Japanese Ambassador hold Manchukuan consulship concurrently. She will formally recognize Manchukuo if she can reap some benefit therefrom. Negotiations for formal recognition will be pushed forward after an exchange of consuls. Delimitation of the

25

24

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

There is a certificate attached which I will not read.

We offer in evidence defense document 2068. This document contains an address of Count UCHIDA, Minister for Foreign Affairs, at the 64th session of the Imperial Diet on January 21, 1933. The Tribunal will recall that Count UCHIDA immediately preceded Foreign Minister HIROTA. This statement shows the attitude of the Foreign Minister with respect to a non-aggression pact between Japan and the Soviet Union. On that occasion Count UCHIDA called attention to the fact that the basic principle of non-aggression between Japan and the Soviet Union was embodied both in the Russo-Japanese basic treaty signed many years ago at Peking and in the Anti-War Pact (Kellogg-Briand Pact).

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this document on two grounds. In the first place, it is irrelevant to the case of HIROTA because he was not in office at the time and should, in our submission, if introduced at all, have been introduced during one of the general phases. In the second place, it is a public statement by a minister which may or may not reflect his real views. I don't

know whether it is necessary to remind the Tribunal that, of course, similar documents in the case of ARAKI were rejected by the Court.

MR. YAMAOKA: If the Tribunal please --THE PRESIDENT: Yes, Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: While it is true that this statement was made by Count UCHIDA while Mr. HIROTA was not in office, nevertheless, we believe it is relevant in showing that the policy of Japan, that is, the policy of the Japanese Government as to the Non-Aggression Pact, had already been decided by the previous government. Consequently, the attitude and actions taken by the accused HIROTA subsequently concerning this is not a matter of his own choosing.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is sustained and the document rejected.

MR. YAMAOKA: I desire to call the witness KANEYAMA, Kazuji.

in montection with this Ancument in the Eurlich war-

ation. The first one relator to vore 2, burngraph 1.

THE YANGERT I STEED THINKS COCCEDED ZOOM

If the Tributal plouds, I wester to hill

19 20

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

23

24

KAZUJI KAMEYAMA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. YAMAOKA: Will the witness state his name and address? My name is KAMEYAMA; my address, 885 Kurachi, Seki-Machi, Kifu Prefecture. MR. YAMAOKA: May the witness be shown defense document 2464? (Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.) Is that document which you have your affidavit? Yes, it is. Is it in all respects true and correct? Yes, it is as you say. MR. YAMAOKA: I offer defense document 2464 in evidence.

If the Tribunal please, I desire to call attention to two errata sheets that have been issued in connection with this document in the English version. The first one relates to page 1, paragraph 1, line 4. The words "and from November 1930 to May

6 7

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

23

22

1935" after "from February 1922 to March 1927" should be inserted; also another errata sheet on this document which substitutes a new page 2 of this document. That is all.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal, the prosecution objects to the whole of this affidavit but on different grounds with regard to parts of it:

Paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5, which relate to the Non-Aggression Pact, on the ground that they add nothing to and in no way qualify the evidence already introduced on this subject by the prosecution;

In exhibit 744, page 7719; 748, page 7720, and 747, page 7727; and with regard to paragraphs 3 and 4 there are the further objections that everything in them is covered by the last exhibit just admitted -- more than covered by the last exhibit just admitted; and further, that they go so far away from the best evidence rule as not to be admissible at all;

Paragraph 3 purports to record, by a gentleman who says he was at the time in Tokyo, a conversation between HIROTA and Mr. Karahan in Moscow. The best evidence of that is obviously Mr. HIROTA himself;

3

2

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

18

19

21

22

24

1 2

And the same with regard to paragraph 4, purporting to record a conversation between HIROTA and UCHIDA which the witness says he learned from an unnamed superior official.

Paragraph 6 to the end of the affidavit deals with the negotiations for the aquisition of what is called the East China Railway. Paragraph 6 is objected to on the ground that it relates to something which took place while Mr. HIROTA was not in office -- or, rather, something took place in Japan with which he had nothing to do.

Paragraph 7, again, on the ground that it purports to record a conversation in Moscow between HIROTA and Karahan when the witness was in Tokyo, and an alleged statement which some unnamed person is said to have said that an unnamed Russian official made;

Paragraph 8 is hearsay coming from an unnamed superior official about a conversation which HIROTA could prove between himself and UCHIDA.

Paragraph 9 is a conversation between a Soviet official and another Ambassador who had succeeded HIROTA in Moscow about which the witness can obviously know nothing, in a period when HIROTA was not in office.

Paragraph 10 relates in immense detail the haggling between the Japanese and Foviet Governments about the precise sum of money to be paid for the railway, the transaction being already sufficiently recorded in exhibit 703, page 7516 and 443A, page 5042.

Paragraph 11 says that certain original documents have been burned, which we have, in fact, produced and exhibited, or, rather, the real originals of which we have produced and exhibited.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka, we will hear your reply in the morning. We will adjourn now until half-past nine tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1602, an adjournment was taken until Friday, 26 September, 1947 at 0930.)

19

20

22

23 24